

1977

# THE HISTORICAL TRAIL



IN COMMEMORATION OF  
THE CAPE MAY MEETING OF  
THE JOINT COMMISSION ON UNITY  
OF THE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN  
BRANCHES OF METHODISM IN AMERICA  
HELD AUGUST 17-23, 1976, IN WHICH  
WERE TAKEN THE FIRST SIGNIFICANT STEPS  
TOWARD THE REUNION OF

THE METHODIST CHURCH  
IN AMERICA

ERECTED BY THE  
125TH ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE  
AND  
BOARD OF LAY ACTIVITIES  
NEW JERSEY ANNUAL CONFERENCE  
BISHOP FRED PIERCE CORSON  
HONORARY CHAIRMAN  
SEPTEMBER 23, 1981

*Cover Photo by  
William E. Thawley*

**Commemorative Monument  
honoring the Cape May Meeting of  
August 17-23, 1876  
Towards the Reunion of the  
Methodist Church in America**

# The Historical Trail

Yearbook of the Historical Society of the  
Southern New Jersey Annual Conference of the  
United Methodist Church

## FOREWORD

GREETINGS! As your new president this past year, I am pleased to present this fifteenth edition of THE HISTORICAL TRAIL. The articles cover different subjects, yet each presents interesting and informative historical information.

We are grateful to our authors for their contributions to this issue. Dr. Kenneth E. Rowe is a member of the faculty at Drew University. His article was presented at the dedication of the Cape May monument as an historic site. His reflections give us the history of the steps taken by the three great branches of Methodism towards unification. The Rev. Joshua Licorish in his article on Harry Hoosier shares with us the greatness and importance of this man, the traveling companion of Francis Asbury. Rev. Licorish is pastor of Zoar United Methodist Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Pennington School has meant much to our conference. The article on the Rev. John Knox Shaw reveals how the concern of this great man caused the school to be established. Thanks to Dr. Charles Smyth and the Rev. Elwood Perkins, retired ministers in our conference, for this article.

Thank you for your interest in our Society. May you enjoy reading *The Historical Trail*.

J. HILLMAN COFFEE  
*President-Editor.*

## THE SPIRIT OF CAPE MAY:

Reflections on the Centennial of the Cape May Conference  
on American Methodist Union, 1876

by

Kenneth E. Rowe  
Drew University

(This paper originally given as an Address at the Centennial of the Cape May Conference, Cape May, N.J., September 12, 1976. On this occasion the Cape May Monument was dedicated as United Methodist Historic Site No. 44)

People throughout human history have marked with stones those special places where holy revelations have happened and historic events have occurred—stones to KEEP the memory and REFRESH the hope—the stones of Stonehenge and of Chartres, of Jacob's pillow and of Wesley's Chapel. In our nomadic culture, we carry portable roots as we journey and live in tents tentatively. Stones on holy ground remind us OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PLACE. We need a few fixed places, like stars in the firmaments, on which we can count, and to which we can, in all our wandering and wondering, return. René Dubos writes that when the words "genius" or "spirit" are used to denote the distinctive characteristics of a given region, city, institution, or place, there is implied "the tacit acknowledgment that each place possesses a set of attributes that determines the uniqueness of its landscape and its people."<sup>1</sup> The unique genius or spirit of Cape May for United Methodists is that here we first began to learn what UNITED means. How appropriate, then, that on this 100th anniversary of the Cape May Conference we dedicate a monument in stone to proclaim to this generation and to succeeding generations that this is a very special place for American Methodists!

Ten years ago American Methodists were celebrating another bicentennial—the 200th anniversary of the formation of the first Methodist societies on these shores. During that celebration there was produced a remarkable music-dance-drama that compressed 200 years of history into fifty minutes. It was part of a state-wide celebration of Methodists in Texas. In the highly accelerated action,

---

<sup>1</sup>Rene Dubos, A GOD WITHIN. New York, Scribner, 1972, p. 6.

the time devoted to the separation and reunion of the two branches of American Methodism—north and south—occupied only ten minutes, yet the skillful use of ballet summed up the events brilliantly. Charles Ferguson vividly describes the scene for us:

The struggle between the two sections was represented quite appropriately by a tug of war, with divided forces of young dancers on the opposite ends of a long rope. When the struggle was over, both sides fell down, thus proclaiming dramatically that nobody had won. . . . .

After the tug of war was over, the dancers drew apart, two in blue capes and two in gray. Soon they made tentative moves toward each other but quickly drew back. The steps were repeated, forward and back, again and again. Each time the dancers withdrew they conferred. And each time they moved toward each other, they came closer. At last the hands of each pair of dancers touched the others timidly. Then each pair withdrew again. At the end of what by skillful suspense in the dance was made to seem an age, the dancers came together, swiftly reversed their capes so that they were all one golden color, embraced, and in a superbly executed acrobatic maneuver formed a human pyramid of triumph.

Action condensed to drama and set to music gives insight after the fact, but it is not effective unless the action has been charged with emotion. The ballet of separation and reunion was powerful and poignant because it caught and stressed in perspective a sweep of events of which those who took part were barely aware.

We are here today to celebrate the beginning of what Bishop John M. Moore called *THE LONG ROAD TO METHODIST UNION*. For it was in Cape May 100 years ago that the first diffident steps in the Methodist minuet of union were taken, when commissioners from the northern and southern churches met for the first time in 30 years. Sixty more years would pass before American Methodism's first major reunion actually took place in 1939. We United Methodists who live 100 years later may wonder why the divorce happened in the first place, why the re-marriage was so long in coming. Let me try to tell the story.

Thirty years before the Cape May meeting—1844 to be exact—American Methodism divided North and South over the twin issues of slavery and the status of the Episcopacy. Methodism's own

<sup>2</sup>I am indebted to Charles Ferguson's vivid description of this historical drama in his *ORGANIZING TO BEAT THE DEVIL*, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday & Co., 1971, pp. 287-288.

civil war began two decades before the national one. Almost from the beginning tempers ran high on both sides. Yet within a year of the division the Southern church offered an olive branch to the North. The organizing conference of the Church South appointed Dr. Lovick Pierce of Georgia as a delegate to visit the next General Conference of the Northern Church in 1848 to establish fraternal relations between the two churches. In the meantime, bitter controversy sprang up on the border and beyond, and a lawsuit about assets of the Publishing House was moving into the federal courts. The northern brethren who assembled in Pittsburgh in the Spring of 1848 were in a vindictive mood. They officially rebuffed Dr. Pierce, repudiated the Plan of Separation, and refused to recognize the corporate existence of the Church south, calling it "the illegitimate offspring of slavery." The decision of the Supreme Court ten years later holding valid the Plan of Separation and forcing the Church North to give to the Southern branch its share of the assets of the Publishing House as agreed in the Plan of Separation did not lessen the hostility between the two churches.<sup>3</sup> Tensions only increased as the bitter ecclesiastical battle of the 1850's became a bloody military one in the 1860's as Methodists on both sides of the Mason Dixon line took up arms against each other. So the two churches went their separate ways for 30 years.

In the waning days of the Civil War the editor of the New York *CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE* queried: "What are to be our ecclesiastical relations to the Methodism of the seceded states?"<sup>4</sup> Many northern Methodists agreed with one of the preachers that the southern church "had been so completely leagued with detestable sin that. . .the apostate church should be exterminated."<sup>5</sup> This program of wiping out Southern Methodism, although its strongest endorsement came from New England Methodists, received classic formulation in the prose of Daniel Curry of the New York *CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE*, the leading weekly of Northern Church. "A

<sup>3</sup>United States Circuit Court (2d circuit). *THE METHODIST CHURCH PROPERTY CASE, REPORT OF THE SUIT OF HENRY B. BASCOM AND OTHERS VS. GEORGE LANE AND OTHERS*, New York. Lane & Scott, 1851. See also James P. Polkington, *THE METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE; A HISTORY*. Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1969, Vol. I, pp. 321-325.

<sup>4</sup>Daniel Curry, "Church Reconstruction in Rebellion," *CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE* (N. Y.) Vol. 40, no. 6 (February 9, 1865) p. 44.

<sup>5</sup>Quoted in Ralph E. Morrow, *NORTHERN METHODISM AND RECONSTRUCTION*, East Lansing, Mich., Michigan State University Press, 1956, pp. 65-66.

policy of earnest and antagonistic aggression must. . .be adopted and put into action," he wrote. "With this we may. . .certainly disintegrate the rival body, and absorb whatever of it shall be worth preserving."<sup>6</sup> The naked details of the plan contemplated "the direct invasion of the South. . .without any regard for the Church, South, the disintegration of the latter whenever it can be effected. . ., and the absorption of its fragments."<sup>7</sup>

But Curry and his crowd did not speak for all northern Methodists. After the war another crowd and another paper suggested another approach to their Methodist brothers and sisters in the south. The spokesman for this party was George Richard Crooks—I'm happy to say, later Professor of church history at Drew. In the middle 1860's Crooks was in New York editing an independent Methodist newspaper called simply *THE METHODIST*. Together with an unusually able editorial staff including John McClintock (1st President of Drew), Bernard H. Nadal (another Drew Professor) and historian Abel Stevens, Crooks stumped for "a formal and general restoration of the unity of American Methodism."<sup>8</sup> The intent was, said Abel Stevens, that Episcopal Methodism, through negotiation, should "again be one" with "a common organization. . .and a common name. . .and a common membership."<sup>9</sup> Bishop Edmund Janes of the New Jersey area and Matthew Simpson of the Philadelphia area aligned themselves with the reunionist party. So did prominent laymen like Union General turned railroad magnate Clinton B. Fisk. Their plan of reunion did not merely envision the acceptance of individual Southern Methodists; it envisioned nothing short of a mutual annulment of the 1844 divorce. And they encouraged other Bishops and editors, clergy and layfolk to move in this direction.

While these attitudes toward the south—the divide and conquer plan and the unionist plan—jostled each other in quest of official approval, the Church South slowly gathered strength following the devastating war. Competition for buildings and members intensified along the border states and well into the heartland of the South,

<sup>6</sup>Daniel Curry, "Our Policy in the South," *Christian Advocate* (N. Y.) vol. 42, no. 17 (April 25, 1867), p. 132.

<sup>7</sup>George R. Crooks, "Methodist Reconstruction in the South," *THE METHODIST* (N. Y.) vol. 6, no. 24 (June 17, 1865), p. 188.

<sup>8</sup>IBID.

<sup>9</sup>Abel Stevens, "Centenary Discourse," *CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE* (N. Y.) vol. 41, no. 21 (May 26, 1865) p. 162.

for Northern Methodist preachers followed Northern troops deep into the South and claimed church property for the northern Church.<sup>10</sup>

The Southern Church, fighting for its very existence and angry over the aggressive action of the northern brethren, was quick to charge that the Methodist Episcopal Church was an arm of the Republican party. Among people who had always heard preached the doctrine of the separation of church and state, and who were now unwilling victims of the Radical reconstruction policy of the federal government, it was an effective propaganda weapon, one that helped to hold the Church South together. Certainly the evidence was everywhere apparent. The success of the northern church in the South among the whites was largely in those areas where military and civilian personnel of the North demanded services of a "loyal" church. The members were largely Republicans; they were carpetbaggers, employees of the federal Freedman's Bureau, and teachers sent out by the Freedman's Aid Society of the church. As such, they were strong supporters of "Radical Reconstruction."

In the Episcopal Address to the General Conference of 1868 Bishop Simpson recounted the success of his church in the South—400 preachers plus a large number of lay preachers in 9 annual conferences covering as many Southern states, and membership of 100,000 plus.<sup>11</sup>

The Methodist press, North and South alike, deprived of the issues of slavery and war, eagerly laid hold of their new point of difference. They argued the property question, the tactics of the northern missionaries in the south, the relevance of such "political" tests of membership as loyalty to the federal government. They hotly debated the place of blacks in church and society. They revived the debates of 1844 and 1848 and disputed at length the points in the history of the separation. They proclaimed their own pious intentions and impugned the motives of their separated brethren.

In view of the bitter reaction of the Church South to the aggressive program of the Northern Church in their midst, it seems incredible that any responsible leaders of either side should have anticipated

<sup>10</sup>For the full story see "A Storm over Zion," in Ralph Morrow's *NORTHERN METHODISM AND RECONSTRUCTION*, 1956, Chapter 3.

<sup>11</sup>Methodist Episcopal Church. *JOURNAL OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE*, 1868, p. 362.

union. Yet with all these events fresh in their minds and barely four years after the Civil War ended, the northern church took the initiative and offered the first olive branch to the south in the Spring of 1869. Bishop Janes and Simpson, messengers appointed by their fellow bishops, called on the southern Methodist bishops who were meeting in St. Louis. The northern bishops spoke of the good that would come of reunion of the two bodies. They went on to say: "As the main cause of the separation has been removed so has the chief obstacle to the restoration," [i.e. slavery].<sup>12</sup>

To this observation the southern Bishops, in a statement prepared by Bishops McTyeire of Tennessee and Paine of Mississippi, made reply, pointing out that slavery was NOT the cause, but only the occasion of the separation. The statement concluded with a declaration of principle and position:

Allow us, in all kindness, brethren, to remind you and to keep the important fact of history prominent that we separated from you in no sense in which you did not separate from us. The separation was by compact and mutual, and nearer approaches to each other can be conducted with hope or a successful issue only on this basis.<sup>13</sup>

That the Methodist Episcopal Church South was still in essence, if not in polity, a legitimate part of Episcopal Methodism was a point to which the southern ecclesiastical mind returned repeatedly. The Southern General Conference meeting the next year (1870) reinforced this strategy and anticipated the day when "proper Christian sentiments and fraternal relations between the two great bodies of . . . Methodism shall be permanently established."<sup>14</sup> The south wasn't ready for union—they merely wanted to open diplomatic relations.

When the "marriage now and courtship later" plan of northern moderates like Crooks and company was exploded by the Southern Methodist refusals, rejected but now wholly downcast suitors altered

<sup>12</sup>FORMAL FRATERNITY; PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCES OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH IN 1872, and 1876 AND OF THE JOINT COMMISSION OF THE TWO CHURCHES ON FRATERNAL RELATIONS AT CAPE MAY, N.J., AUGUST 16-23, 1876. New York, Nelson & Phillips; Nashville, A. H. Redford, 1876, p. 8.

<sup>13</sup>FORMAL FRATERNITY, p. 11.

<sup>14</sup>Methodist Episcopal Church, South, JOURNAL OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE, 1870, p. 318.

their aims and strategy. In place of impulsive insistence on organic union, the northern moderates resolved to seek the affection of the Church South on the latter's terms. The immediate goal became "fraternity" and even this goal had to be pursued warily. Before the beginning of fraternity between the two estranged churches lay prolonged and complex preparations. And we can only hint at the intensity of the negotiations. General Fisk opened his home in St. Louis and later his Jersey shore home at Seabright for strategy sessions. A flurry of letters criss-crossed the Mason-Dixon Line. Prominent pulpit exchanges were arranged deep in each other's territory. Even a series of joint Camp Meetings were arranged.

Formal negotiations on the new basis began when the Northern General Conference in 1872 authorized three emissaries—New York pastor Albert S. Hunt, Charles H. Fowler (then President of Northwestern University, later Bishop) Northern Methodism's number one layman—General Clinton B. Fiske—to visit its southern counterpart. Two years later the messengers were received cordially, but reminded by a committee of the conference that the causes that led to the separation in 1844 had not disappeared, chief among them being the difference in conception of the powers of the Episcopacy and General Conference. The committee said quite frankly that as long as the cause of division remained, "each church can do its work and fulfill its mission most effectively by maintaining a separate organization."<sup>15</sup> Organic union was not to be considered.

The northern delegates, although it was not explicitly set out in their instructions, intimated that an appointment of a commission by the Church South to parley over grievances would meet a like response from the 1876 General Conference of the Church North. The Southerners, with appropriate hesitancy, acted upon this intelligence. They established the suggested commission and dispatched messengers—including the venerable Lovick Pierce of Georgia rebuffed by the North in 1848, now past ninety—to the next General Conference of the North to inform them that the Church South was ready for a settlement of differences. Sensing victory was at hand on the eve of the General Conference Fisk dispatched a letter to Albert S. Hunt, April 11, 1876:

I think we ought to render a good report of our Louisville visitation [in May 1874] and that we may key-note other pro-

<sup>15</sup>FORMAL FRATERNITY, p. 37.

ceedings. I am advised that Dr. Pierce will be on hand to say that "fraternity is already established." If so, WE DID IT!<sup>16</sup>

Four weeks later the Northern General Conference warmly received the distinguished representatives from the south, and reciprocated by appointing commissioners to work toward an opening of formal relations and a mutual recognition of each others ministry, membership and property. Correspondence between the chairman of the two delegations—Morris D'C. Crawford for the North and Edward H. Myers of the South—fixed a meeting for the middle of August that year at Cape May. Here the joint commission was to seek the removal of "all obstacles to formal fraternity between the two churches."<sup>17</sup>

Three clergymen and two laymen from each church gathered in historic Congress Hall in Cape May on the morning of August 17. The hotel was so-named because it was a favorite vacation spot for Congressmen, Senators and even Presidents. It was a popular summer white house for President Grant in the early 1870's. Both sides knew well the obstacles to formal fraternity were principally two—the failure of the Northerners to recognize the Church South and the attendant property contest arising from the presence of two white Methodisms in the South. If Methodism has been split by what Northerners called an "unauthorized, violent and unjustifiable secession" rather than by mutual consent as the South claimed, the latter's right to real estate, owned before division, might be controverted. Church South leaders were understandably jittery over the possibility of being hauled into court by Northerners. In order to preclude all such legal contention over property, Southern Methodists insisted that their church was a legitimate successor of the Methodist Episcopal Church as it existed before 1844.

The conversations of the joint commission extended over a week. That harmony was achieved in view of earlier personal collisions between the commissioners sounds the depths of the desire to replace the three-decade brawl with something less jarring. By the evening of the first day the commissioners from the North met southern insistence more than halfway and worked out and adopted

<sup>16</sup>Autograph letter, Clinton B. Fisk to Albert S. Hunt, New York, April 11, 1876. In Fisk papers, Drew University Library.

<sup>17</sup>FORMAL FRATERNITY, p. 58. For the official correspondence which preceded the Cape May Conference see FORMAL FRATERNITY, pp. 20-56.

what Bishop Moore called "a magnanimous formula."<sup>18</sup> It asserted:

Each of said churches is a legitimate branch of Episcopal Methodism in the United States, having a common origin in the Methodist Episcopal Church organized in 1784.<sup>19</sup>

The declaration went on to say that the Methodist Episcopal Church South had been brought into being by the voluntary exercise of the right of its Annual Conferences and that its "Ministers and members, with whose of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have constituted one Methodist family, though in distinct ecclesiastical connections."<sup>20</sup>

After the key demand of the Church South had been granted, the commissioners turned to a consideration of the property in dispute. "Rules for the Adjustment of adverse Claims to Church Property" were unanimously adopted,<sup>21</sup> and on the basis of these rules the commissioners went to work to settle specific cases presented for judgement. By August 21 they had completed the disposition of eleven disputes.

With the points at issue resolved by the delegates so far as they were able to, the joint commission prepared a lengthy "Address to the Bishops, Ministers and Members of the M.E. Church and the M.E. Church South," the full text of which appeared in the next day's NEW YORK TIMES<sup>22</sup> and in the church press in the next weekly edition. In their address the commissioners hailed their work as inaugurating "a new epoch in Methodism" and asserted that the two sister churches "have no further reason for sectional disputes or acrimonious differences." Before parting the commissioners rose, offered prayers of thanksgiving, joined hands and sang "Blest Be the Tie that Binds."

Church resolutions often receive little notice after the flurry of excitement of the moment of passage. They get printed and then forgotten. But not this one. The eyes and ears of society and church were fixed, as it were, on Cape May. The dailies of the secular press beat the church press to the punch and as usual jumped to unwar-

<sup>18</sup>John M. Moore, THE LONG ROAD TO METHODIST UNION, New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, p. 65.

<sup>19</sup>FORMAL FRATERNITY, p. 67.

<sup>20</sup>FORMAL FRATERNITY, p. 67.

<sup>21</sup>FORMAL FRATERNITY, p. 79.

<sup>22</sup>NEW YORK TIMES, August 24, 1876, p. 2; full text also in FORMAL FRATERNITY, pp. 77-83.

ranted conclusions. The *NEW YORK TRIBUNE* called it "the event of the centennial year." Another paper boldly announced—"The Methodist Churches of the North and South are again in single body!"<sup>23</sup> A bit of premature to day the least! The church press took pains to try to tell it like it really was to the folks back home—unification of the churches was neither proposed nor endorsed; friendly relations only were being fostered.

George Crooks' successor in the editorial chair of *THE METHODIST* printed the full text of the address of the Cape May Commission on the front page of the September 2d issue under the headline "A Great Victory" and then editorialized on the whole affair:

We record, with profound gratitude to Almighty God [wrote David H. Wheeler] the reconciliation of the two chief bodies of American Methodists. We have been laughed at for regarding this reconciliation as possible, and sneered at for treating the promotion of it as a religious duty. The scoffers are welcome to the front seats. and may make the heartiest amens. The reconciliation is by ample authority—it is complete; and, as we have often said it would, it strengthens all and harms none. Neither church loses an ounce of right, or a hair of privilege. The existing status is accepted, and made binding on both churches.

We are glad that it is done, and well done. The commissioners have earned a large place in the enduring regard of Methodists the world over. We are glad that they represented our church so faithfully, . . . They gave nothing away; they were asked to give nothing away. It was on both sides a receiving—and that is all there was of it. We feel better for plainly calling the Southern men brothers, and joint heirs in Wesleyan doctrine and method. The South feels better for recognizing our pastors at their doors as fellow laborers in a common cause.<sup>24</sup>

The strong sense of fraternity which developed here during those hot summer days in 1876 was not immediately conveyed to the whole of both churches. Many took vigorous exception to the spirit and the decisions of those meetings. Two areas in the northern church in particular found the Cape May accord difficult to accept—

<sup>23</sup>Quoted in *THE METHODIST* (N. Y.) vol. 17, no. 36 (September 2, 1876) p. 561.

<sup>24</sup>David H. Wheeler, "A Great Victory," *THE METHODIST* (N. Y.) vol. 17, no. 36 (September 2, 1876) p. 568. See also Jonas O. Peck's enthusiastic sermon in the national capital: "Harmonious Methodism," a sermon delivered at Mount Vernon Place N.E. Church, Washington, D. C., Sunday August 27, 1876. Full text printed in *THE METHODIST* (N. Y.) vol. 17, no. 37 (September 9, 1876) p. 590-591.

New England and upstate New York. *Zion's Herald*, the journal of the New England Clergy was noncommittal in its editorial comment and waited three weeks to print even an abbreviated account of the affair.<sup>25</sup> The indifference of the Boston paper, however, was a more subtle manifestation of hostility than that demonstrated by the voice of the middle and northern New York state region—*THE NORTHERN CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE*. The Syracuse paper denounced the "Cape May" accord as "sell out" because it gave "legitimacy" to the origin of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.<sup>26</sup> With only one dissent in 113 votes the Central New York Annual Conference the next Spring (1877) petitioned the General Conference of 1880 to emphatically disapprove the work of the commissioners.<sup>27</sup>

I'm happy to say that the response of the two New Jersey Conferences to the Cape May report was more positive, and I might add, more representative. The New Jersey Conference, meeting in Trenton the next Spring resolved:

That we recognize the successful results of the meeting in August last, at Cape May, of fraternal Commissioners of the M.E. Church and the M.E. Church, South, as the harbinger of a closer union and fellowship between the bodies in the future, that shall increase their efficiency as agencies for the salvation of souls, the welfare of the country, and the glory of God.<sup>28</sup>

After a long list of whereases drafted by Drew President John F. Hurst, the Newark Conference, meeting in Jersey City resolved:

That we discern the will and hand of God in the appointment and work of the Commission; and that we heartily rejoice in the prospect of complete concord and perpetual fraternity between ourselves and our brethren of the Church South.<sup>29</sup>

Even more unanimity and downright relief greeted the report in the South. In several lengthy editorial pieces editor Thomas

<sup>25</sup>*ZION'S HERALD* (Boston) Vol. 53, no. 36 (September 7, 1876) p. 283.

<sup>26</sup>[Orris H. Warren] "The Obstacles Removed," *NORTHERN CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE*, (Syracuse), vol. 36, no. 35 (August 31, 1876) p. 4.

<sup>27</sup>[Orris H. Warren] "Report on Fraternity," *NORTHERN CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE* (Syracuse), Vol. 36, no. 42 (October 19, 1876) p. 4.

<sup>28</sup>Methodist Episcopal Church Conference, New Jersey. *MINUTES*, 1877, p. 22.

<sup>29</sup>Methodist Episcopal Church, Conferences, Newark, *MINUTES* 1877, p. 43-44.



O. Summers of the Southern Church's chief paper, *THE NASHVILLE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE*, reported widespread satisfaction. One leading Southern churchman reported in that paper: [Our church] has been vindicated. That is enough. Let us have peace!"<sup>30</sup>

An Atlanta Methodist paper was even more exuberant: "The Thirty Years' War is ended, and the peace of Methodism is practically secured."<sup>31</sup> For official reaction from Southern Conferences, that of the North Georgia Conference is representative. Meeting in Sparta later that fall they resolved:

1st, That the North Georgia Conference, in conference assembled, express our profound gratitude to the God of all grace for endowing His servants, the Commissioners, with wisdom to formulate the existing sentiment of fraternity in language at once venerable to both Churches and acceptable to this Conference.

2nd, That we unite with all who accept his basis of Fraternity in endeavoring to forward the work of "spreading Scriptural holiness over this land committed in the providence of God to our two Methodisms."<sup>32</sup>

The minutes of that first gathering at Cape May and response on both sides are highly instructive, for they reveal the tragic irony of Christians in disarray on grounds that had little to do with doctrine. The commissioners at Cape May as well as pastors and layfolk back home were very much aware of their doctrinal consensus, and they were awkwardly eager for "unity in the Spirit." But their separate histories had estranged them more deeply than their brave words admitted. Yet the bread of Christian fellowship cast upon ecumenical waters is never wholly lost, and, as conference and consultation followed one another, their cumulative influence began to be manifest. Reunion was yet three-quarters of a century away, but the essential factor of Methodism—religious experience—supported by Common tradition, common usages and a common symbolic name—like yeast began to leaven the whole.

The Cape May declaration established beyond doubt the two largest American Methodist bodies of equal stature and integrity

<sup>30</sup>C.W. Miller, "The Fraternal Commission and their work," *NASHVILLE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE*, vol. 36, no. 36 (September 9, 1876) p. 1.

<sup>31</sup>Quoted in editorial "The Fraternal Address" *WESTERN CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE* (Cincinnati) Vol. 43, no. 36 (September 6, 1876) p. 281.

<sup>32</sup>Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Conferences. North Georgia. *MINUTES*, 1877, p. 13.

at the bargaining table. That is all. But it proclaimed a principle without which further negotiations would have been doomed to failure. The declaration left an agenda a mile long that ran in and out of thickets that hid practically every problem of human relations and government in the church and out. Of course the one constant road-block, and the one on which unification would either succeed or fail, was the presence of a substantial number of blacks in the northern church. The Church South, whose black membership dwindled as slaves were freed and fled shortly after the war, set up a separate church for their black members so that from 1870 on Southern Methodism had no black members. It is interesting to note that the issue of black membership in the northern church did not come up in the negotiations leading up to Cape May. The issue of black presence in a united Methodism was left for phase two of the movement toward re-unification, which did not get under way until early in this century.

The sixty years between the Cape May Conference in 1876 and the uniting conference in Kansas City in 1939 were filled with painstaking negotiations, by attempts to find a meeting ground on which to pitch the tents of agreement. There was hardly a day or a night, during those years when some clergyman or bishop, layman or lay woman, black person or white, was not cogitating on compromises that might make it possible to put the pieces together again. When in 1939 the two geographical Methodisms, north and south, did unite and were joined by the Methodist Protestant Church, which had departed the fold in 1830 over issues of lay rights and clergy domination, the achievement was a tribute not only to skilled negotiations but also to stubborn adherence to Wesley's vision that Methodists are "one people in all the world." Although the road between Cape May in 1876 and Kansas City in 1939 was long and rocky, the Spirit of Cape May, together with the Holy Spirit, triumphed in the end.

100 Years after the Cape May Conference, we United Methodists still find ourselves struggling to understand what it means to be a united church and a uniting church. Ecumenical yearnings toward unity are matched by internal yearnings toward schism. Inside the church we live in a state of creative tension, an ambiguous but necessary detente between factions which are all too visible and vocal in a General Conference year. Representatives of our church's several caucuses—Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American (the

big four ethnic caucuses) plus women, youth, gays, evangelicals and charismatics—laid out their group's agenda for the whole church to see. The fact that no major explosions or even angry confrontations took place at General Conference in Portland this year means that we United Methodists are beginning to understand what it means to be united, that our unity in Christ and with each other does not mean uniformity. John Wesley put it this way, "If we cannot as yet think alike in all things, at least we may love alike."<sup>38</sup>

Keeping a pluralistic church from being rent asunder is an urgent priority for us all in the 1970's. The way to keep everything that's nailed down from coming loose, I think is, to follow the example of our fathers in the faith who in this place after 30 years decided to bury that hatchet and go to the conference table. Let consultation rather than confrontation be our strategy as it was theirs. For only then will there be time for hearts to be changed, only then will there be time for minds to be educated, above all, only then will there be time for the Holy Spirit to move through the church.

Pluralism is not an option to consider; it is a reality to accept—and celebrate. Partnership in the Gospel between Christians of many different hues is the mark of mission today. It is a critically important partnership, for in it lies the hope of our world so grievously divided. In the last analysis a pluralistic church is held together only by the conviction that all of us are "One in Christ." Let that fragile vision of unrealized unity in Christ be ever before us as we chart our way through the 1970's and beyond. Long live the spirit of Cape May!

<sup>38</sup>John Wesley, JOHN WESLEY'S LETTER TO A ROMAN CATHOLIC, edited by Michael Hurley, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1968, p. 56.

HARRY HOSIER  
African Pioneer Preacher

by

Joshua E. Licorish  
Zoar United Methodist Church  
Philadelphia, Pa.

Harry Hosier, also known as Black Harry, was born a slave near Fayetteville, North Carolina. He was manumitted, converted, and became the first African local preacher of his newly found faith. Although Francis Asbury's initial encounter with Hosier is not recorded in his journal, his entry of June 29, 1780 indicates that he believed their meeting to have been providentially arranged.

Harry became the most eloquent exhorter of his day. Those who heard him agreed that he demonstrated unusual intellectual capacity, remarkable retention, and creative ability. He was able to reproduce in dramatic form the messages of the educated divines with rare freshness, power, and magnetic vitality. Frequently, his name was used to draw an appreciable audience for the eminent itinerants whom he excelled in popularity. He shared preaching opportunities with many proclaimers of the gospel, among them being Asbury, Coke, Garrettson, Whatcoat, Boehm, Walker and Colbert. No singular personage of the Asburian period of Methodism espoused a more genuine Biblical approach to the Methodist message or presented the cause of Christ more convincingly than Harry Hosier, traveling companion and servant-guide of Francis Asbury.

Watson's Annals of Philadelphia provides insight on practices of early Methodism when it was recorded that they "did not as a people value or expect an educated ministry." After conversion, "the call" was the paramount indicator of readiness to proclaim the gospel. Formal education for leadership in the societies was appreciated but not required. Harry had no reason to feel out-classed academically by the few formally trained Methodists.

According to Raybold in *Reminiscences of Methodism in West Jersey*, Hosier resisted learning to read and write because: "When he tried to read he lost the gift of preaching." To the inquiring and

amazed people, his frequent answer was, "I sing by faith, pray by faith and do everything by faith; without faith in the Lord Jesus I can do nothing." He thus sacrificed academic achievement in order to be a clear, channel for the divine declaration of the gospel.

It was Harry who was selected by Asbury in November, 1784 to take the newly arrived Dr. Thomas Coke on an orientation and inspection tour of the Peninsula, prior to the Christmas Conference, after the first Methodist divine ordinances had been instituted in America and John Wesley's plan for the liberated colonies had been made known. In the meantime, Freeborn Garrettson was also "sent as an arrow" to call the absent brethren to meet at Lovely Lane Chapel on Christmas Eve. Harry, too, was among the Methodists who gathered to organize the Church.

Later, he traveled with Garrettson up the Hudson territory in 1789; continued with him into New England, and was present when he first met Jesse Lee on their triumphant circuit expansion journey in 1790. Even though he was "very uncivilly" received in Hartford; at Boston, Harry was warmly received and boarded with Prince Hall, the Master Mason of the Africans.

It is said that "the first notice of Methodism in New York City appeared in the New York Packet, September 11, 1786, telling about an African whose excellent preaching excited more interest than that of the Bishop." The Baltimore newspapers, it is related, gave more attention to the "singular black man" than to the Methodist Bishop.

Henry Boehm, leader of the German Methodists, stated that many would rather hear Hosier than Asbury. It was his preaching in Wilmington, Delaware when Methodists were unpopular that helped create a favorable atmosphere for them in a hitherto hostile territory. It is recorded that when Bishop was expected and Harry was also present to preach, Old Asbury Chapel was not large enough to accommodate the crowd. Those who gathered outside could not see the preacher, but listened to the preaching of the gospel with great satisfaction. One who had come to heckle the Bishop remarked, "If all the Methodist preachers could preach like the Bishop, we should like to be constant hearers." Someone nearby replied, "That was not the Bishop, but the Bishop's servant." He retorted, "If such be the servant, what must the master be?"

The Quakers recognized him as one who preached under "immediate inspiration" of the spirit of God.

The scholarly Thomas Coke, after serious meditation, having heard Harry preach several times, exclaimed: "I really believe he is the best preacher in the world. There is an amazing power attends his preaching. . . ."

Dr. Benjamin Rush boasted: "Harry is the greatest orator in America."

Dr. Sargent of Philadelphia, upholding the prevailing opinion, "He was the greatest natural orator I have ever heard."

John Ledman, early Methodist historian, wrote: "Harry was a more popular speaker than Asbury or almost anyone else in his day."

William Colbert, in his unpublished journal, bears witness of his usefulness to Methodism when he recorded: "Harry gave a powerful exhortation. . . excellent discourse. . . spoke with life and power. . ." Harry's preaching affected the people. On one occasion, although Colbert had been ailing and had not preached for some time, upon hearing one of Harry's soul-searching gospel messages, wrote, "After him, I felt freedom in speaking for about ten minutes." Listening to a discourse from Revelation 3: 20 on another occasion, Colbert reasoned and inscribed: "This is not a man-made preacher. It is really surprising to hear a man that cannot read, preach like this man."

Bishop Asbury assigned him to visit the Trenton Circuit with John Walker in 1803. The seasoned veteran was not acceptable to a lady in the home in Hackettstown where the preacher was staying. She expressed objection to the presence of the "black." Hosier, having overheard the conversation, withdrew to the garden where he took her before the throne of grace in prayer until the appointed hour of the meeting. While Reverend Walker preached, Harry was seated in front of him keeping a silent vigil. After the message, Harry arose and began his exhortation. He spoke of sin as a disease; saying that all were affected and the Lord had sent a remedy by the hands of a physician, but, alas! he was black! and some might reject the only means of cure because of the hands by which it was sent to them that day. It is said that he continued to speak in a humble manner until all were moved. After a fervent prayer, the lady's conscience was disturbed, and she, too, was converted with others.

He was a popular person at Camp Meetings, Quarterly Meetings, and Love Feasts. Wherever Methodists gathered to witness, Harry

was present to share in the proclamation of the word of redemption. He was the one African of the eastern frontier who acted out with earnest devotion the urgent commission of John Wesley to his disciples. . . "I let you loose on the great continent of America. Publish your message in the open face of the sun and do all the good you can." Harry covered the Methodist itinerant-trail from the Carolina to New England, preaching the good news of salvation to all.

Recently, a document found in Old St. George's Church revealed the concern of nineteen preachers of the Philadelphia Conference for Harry as they united in petitioning the bishops and Methodist Episcopal Conference which was to assemble in Chestertown, Maryland, May 1, 1805. It stated "that they believe Harry Hosier, an African, a man that would be very useful if the Bishop and Conference in their wisdom could without establishing a bad precedent direct him."

Harry's increasing popularity and independence led Asbury to record in his journal the following statement after seeking to induce him to accompany him on a trip into Virginia. "Harry seems to be unwilling to go with me. I fear his speaking so much to white people in the city has been, or will be injurious; he has been flattered, and may be ruined."

Although he became a back-slider, it was not because of flattery, but due rather to the power of wine. However, he did not remain outside of the Christian fold for long. He experienced forgiveness through an all night soul-wrestling vigil under a tree in the Southwark section of Philadelphia. Like Jacob at the break of dawn, he gained a new blessing and reclaimed his spiritual freedom, evermore to be victorious over that temptation.

Harry suffered much for his faith and preaching. William Colbert, presiding elder, was moved by the recitation of the crosses he had borne. Said he, "I was very much affected at some of the experience of Harry Hosier which he in private conversation related."

On Harry's homebound journey, Colbert visited him several times. After his first call he declared: "He believed Hosier to be in favour with God" (March 22, 1806). On the next occasion, "he was happy in the Lord and to appearance within a few days of eternity" (April 30, 1806). On his final visit he said, "Harry appears to be for a short time for this world but happy in God" (May 1, 1806). Attending his funeral, May 18, 1806, Colbert said, "The

people were affected." After a suitable Methodist service, a mighty procession, black and white, followed his bier for interment at the Palmer Burying Ground, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

No account of the beginning and expansion of the Methodist movement in America would be complete without numbering Harry Hosier among its unsung pioneer preachers. Future unbiased historians will accredit him as the first ecumenical preacher of American Methodism. He, more than any other itinerant of his time, fused large interdenominational audiences through the gospel according to Methodism. He possessed the dynamic which dissolved the boundaries of separatism, making all one in Christ. His preaching partnership with Francis Asbury provided Methodism an outreach to the enslaved and the free, the poor and the rich, the churchless and the churchgoing.

(Originally published 1967 by Afro-Methodist Associates, Philadelphia, Pa. Reprinted by permission of the Author)

## THE REVEREND JOHN KNOX SHAW

The materials contained in this paper are, in part, a condensation, digest and/or selected passages from "The Life and Words of The Reverend John Knox Shaw" [printed for private distribution] in 1887 by D. H. Carroll, Baltimore, Maryland. The volume was loaned to me by The Reverend F. Elwood Perkins from his private collection.

Charles R. Smyth, D. D. Headmaster Emeritus  
of The Pennington School, Pennington, N. J.

June 1, 1975

### 1.

John Knox Shaw was born at the town of Newton-Hamilton, in the south of County Armagh, Ireland, on the 10th of April, 1800. His ancestors, at least on the father's side, were not of the ancient Irish race, but of Scottish blood. At some period, perhaps during the migration of the "plantators", they crossed to Ireland, and in the fruitful plains of Armagh found a home. As indicated by his name, a descendant of that sturdy old patriot and Puritan John Knox had married with a Shaw in earlier generations. They had his spirit as well as his blood, for they were Presbyterians of the "straightest sect." These earlier fathers formed Irish alliances, so that the strong and sober sense of the Scotch was tempered by the vivacity, humor and eloquence of the Celt. While his name and blood for the most part was Scotch, and his life, from earliest infancy, grew in America, yet he may be classed by his birth with that great number of Erin's sons who have enriched our age, our country and above all, the Church with which his name is indissolubly associated.

### 2.

All Europe was engaged in wars from the decade before John's birth until the Peace of 1815. In all lands the lamentable waste of

war induced evils which no country suffered more than Ireland. Universal distress oppressed the people and led them to look toward the young Republic across the seas. Thus a migration, even among the comparatively fortunate Protestant farmers of Ulster, bore the infant John in his mother's arms, across the Atlantic. Through all of the vicissitudes of this uprooting, Mr. Shaw, the elder, was, sustained in his purpose by his good wife, who was a woman of deep piety, kept faith that they were led by the hand of God.

When John, less than a year old, took ship with his family and after a stormy voyage of six weeks, landed at Portsmouth, N. H. with some substance, the proceeds from the sale of property in the old country, Mr. Shaw was able to purchase a good farm in Washington, Cambridge Co., N. Y. There were five children: three daughters and two sons—John, the youngest and Alexander who died in early manhood. He was specially solicitous on behalf of John whom he destined for college and a profession. However, through lack of business capability, he gradually lost the whole of his property. Thus John's attention was turned from his books to work and family support.

In his sixteenth year he left home "to seek his fortune." He engaged in selling books through the countryside in which he achieved more than moderate success and in seven months returned home with \$150.00, no mean amount. Shortly came an attack of remittent fever, thought to have come out of the oft poor conditions of his journeyings. The malady was intense and the physician felt sure his patient must die. But his mother would not give him up; she took herself to prayer and gained an assurance that her son would live.

He had been a youth of singular morality and correctness of conduct but was not decidedly pious. Now, however, he was like a man suddenly aroused by the call to danger. His spiritual struggle, protracted through several days, was most severe, but at last he came into the favor of God. After many days of deep distress, deliverance came, his conversion positive and complete. The leisure of his convalescence was employed in painstaking study of the scriptures, a practice he observed all of his life. He became convinced of his duty to make a public confession of religion and unite with the Christian church. His attention turned to the church of his fathers but found himself utterly unable to accept the Calvinistic doctrines which they expected.

In a little while he accepted the position of teacher at White Plains, N. Y., where, for the first time he came in contact with the Methodists. He came under the influence of a minister who gladly shared time with him and introduced him to the "Book of Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church." Herein he found a body of doctrine and a form of polity, corresponding with what he believed to be the teaching of the Bible. Moreover the manner of worship among these people was congenial to him. A formal union with the church was a matter of course. At this period he used his free time in systematic study of the Bible and other religious books and in writing on themes which deal with man's relation to his Maker. He even published a volume of religious poems.

From White Plains he accepted a like position at Bloomfield, New Jersey. There being no Methodist Church at this place he united with a society at Belleville where, in a short time, he was appointed as class-leader and soon after that an exhorter, in which efforts he was greatly rewarded by bringing to pass a revival of religion. By this time he was persuaded of his call to preach the Gospel of Christ. His signal success as a leader and an exhorter, in connection with manifest intellectual qualifications, was the ground of his licensure as a preacher. This same Quarterly Conference held November 19, 1824, recommended him as a probationer in the itinerancy or regular ministry of pastors with the Philadelphia Annual Conference.<sup>1</sup> At the session of that body held April 14, 1825, at Philadelphia, John Knox Shaw was "received on trial" and appointed to Hamburg Circuit, where he preached his first sermon at Snufftown, Box County, New Jersey. He was then just twenty-four years of age and his ministry and life, ending together, continued from that time thirty-three years, which were divided between the following places: 1825-26 Hamburg Circuit;<sup>2</sup> 1827-28 Asbury Circuit;<sup>3</sup> 1829 Patterson Station; 1830 Essex Circuit; 1831-

<sup>1</sup>The boundaries of the Philadelphia Annual Conference were the "whole of the peninsula between the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, and all of that part of Pennsylvania lying between the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers, and all of the State of New Jersey with Staten Island."

<sup>2</sup>The Hamburg Circuit measured three hundred miles around and spilled over into Pennsylvania and New York states.

<sup>3</sup>Shaw was ordained deacon in 1827 at Smyrna, Delaware and an elder in 1829 at Philadelphia.

32 Staten Island Circuit;<sup>4</sup> 1833 New Providence Circuit; 1834-35 Long Branch Circuit; 1836-37 PENNINGTON STATION; 1838-39 Swedesboro Circuit; 1840-41 Camden Station; 1842-43 Mount Holly Station; 1844 Burlington Station; 1845-46-47-48, Camden District; 1849-50-51-52, Trenton District; 1853-54 Franklin-Street Station, Newark; 1855-56 Morristown Station; 1857-58 Warren-Street Station, Newark.

John Knox Shaw played a prime role in the founding of THE PENNINGTON SEMINARY (later named The Pennington School) at Pennington, New Jersey. As early as 1835 at the first meeting of the New Jersey Annual Conference the question of creating a Methodist educational institution was raised. In the next two years committees studied and reported with Conference action taken to give the proposed school to the community raising the largest sum toward its founding. This general statement is followed by material from (a) The Life and Works of John Knox Shaw, and, (b) from the 1963 Penseman, the yearbook of The Pennington School on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of the founding of the school—the latter from an earlier composition of Kenneth Anderson. (C.R.S.)

(a). Mr. Shaw served the Pennington Station 1836-37 during which time one hundred and fifty joined the Methodist Church while a number of his converts attached themselves to the Presbyterians. At this time he was much engaged in the project of founding a Conference Seminary at Pennington. He gave himself, with his usual ardor, to the enterprise, and it was in good measure due to his business capacity, tact and energy, that the scheme was presented to the Conference in 1838 (at the close of his term at Pennington) in such shape, and with such a subscription (five thousand dollars) as that it was at once approved. This was the origin of a prosperous school, which now numbers its pupils by the hundreds and its alumni by thousands. He said in after years: "The labor attendant upon the establishment of the Seminary was exhausting, but the Institution has been of incalculable benefit to the Church, and the work, so freely given is not regretted. He was a trustee

<sup>4</sup>Staten Island is in New York; all other appointments (save part of Hamburg Circuit) are in New Jersey.

from the beginning until the time of his death. Dr. Thomas Hanlon (later O'Hanlon), President of the Seminary (from 1867 until 1902, with a break of but a few years) in a letter to one of Mr. Shaw's sons, says, "Your honored and sainted father was the founder of Pennington Seminary . . . . All the early records give him credit of having originated the school."

(b). From the Penseman: "In 1835, there was no Methodist institution which could adequately educate the sons of the frugal ministers on the Eastern Seaboard. In 1836 the Methodist Conference in order to consider the practicability of a school in East Jersey, created a committee which decided that, if sufficient capital could be obtained, the Conference would select a suitable location, erect a building, appoint a principal and do whatever else might be necessary in the organization of a preparatory school."

"A year later, the Conference announced that whatever town would make the largest subscription, would secure the school. Several New Jersey towns, especially Hackettstown, Pemberton and Pennington, realized that the school would be a decided asset to their community and a friendly competition arose for its location. On April 25, 1838, the committee was created to bring a school into existence."

"Reverend John Knox Shaw, the young Methodist pastor of Pennington, determined that his town should secure the school. Mr. Shaw began a laborious canvass for subscriptions throughout New Jersey, and so much was pledged to him that the Conference, at once, decided to locate the school at Pennington."

"In April, 1839, the new school was incorporated, and a month later, the cornerstone of the original building was laid. . . ."

". . . the Administration Building (O'Hanlon Hall) and (John Knox) Shaw Memorial Chapel were built in 1901. . ."

5.

*Shaw in physique:* At forty-five he was in his full prime, intellectually and physically. He was six feet in height, straight-limbed, well built of fine physique, weighing about one hundred and eighty pounds. He had a dark complexion, black hair slightly tinged with gray, a bright piercing black eye, a large mobile mouth and a good voice which he could manage at will. . . . Indeed, this outward grace was a fitting sign, the worthy embodiment, and the proper

servitor of his mental and moral nature. [It should be noted that the remittent fever that struck him in youth, under the severe strain of circumstances of living, travel, and pressures of work, reappeared in more than one period of his life, indeed finally took him in death].

*The mind of Shaw.* His intellect was alert, vigorous, capable of sustained effort; logical rather than imaginative; eminently practical, penetrative, matter-of-fact, common sense, and prone to simple directness of endeavor, rather than metaphysical; deeply devout yet having no trace of mysticism. He cultivated his powers with assiduity, being not only a reader all his life but a student. He mastered to some degree the languages. He read the best authors in the theology of his day that he could obtain.

*Shaw the preacher-pastor.* Theologically he held to Wesleyan Arminianism, and as he preached this system, the center and pivot of all truth was the atonement of Christ for the whole world. He delighted greatly in the Methodistic doctrines of the witness of the Spirit and of Heart Purity. Hence, his preaching while emphatically "doctrinal" was also practical, persuasive, and assertive of the absolute conviction of experience. In moral nature conscientiousness was probably the most powerful element. His generosity was profuse and frequently led him beyond the bounds of propriety. He was endowed with quick sympathies and tender affections. Hence his people esteemed him as a friend and the preachers, a brother beloved. While his bearing was sober, it was not official, nor perfunctory, but natural and was tempered by cheerfulness. He always attracted good congregations, he delivered in the simplest yet most eloquent manner. As a pastor he had few superiors.

*Shaw the churchman.* As an administrator his large charity, his general insight into the motives that govern men, and his unusual business capacity made him uniformly successful. The record of his work in successive charges showed a steady advance in usefulness, an ever enlarging adequacy and productiveness of effort and maturing of his faculties. This was recognized by the church and approved by promotions to special duties. In the course of his pastorate he built many churches and parsonages, beside accomplishing the repair of many more, and the liquidation of numerous debts on the property under his care. The preeminent seal to his ministry, not usually attained in large measure by one gifted with administrative capacity, was the conversion of great numbers of persons.

*Shaw in the parsonage.* In the domestic virtues he was "an example to the flock." To his household he embodied St. Paul's noble delineation of the Christian Bishop: "temperate, sober-minded, orderly, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not quarrelsome but gentle, no lover of money; one that ruleth his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity." The spiritual and temporal welfare of his family occupied a large portion of his thoughts and prayers and any possible sacrifice was cheerfully made for their advancement. In one appointment he learned to his discomfort that an old tavern, entirely unfit for occupancy, had been rented for the parsonage. Rather than subject his lovely and devoted wife and dear children to such, he leased on his own account a comfortable home for his loved ones. Nor did he forget his aging parents who had brought him from Ireland to the New World, for in the early pastoral days he mortgaged his own future to give them a settled home in their old age ministering to them in every way until he put them to rest in Washington, New Jersey. He was a devoted son, husband and father.

*Shaw the victor.* All of his ministerial life he had been a kind but brave and determined warrior. In his last appointment 1857-58 in Newark, New Jersey, he faced one of the greatest struggles of his entire ministry. Yet against the crisis and over great odds he was winning as he had in so many other situations. But in the midst of the strife, the remittent fever took hold again and on October 14, 1858, he gained victory through Christ over the "last enemy" and received a city appointment at last in God's eternal realm. After the solemn obsequies in the church, the body was, amid the tears of his family, his people, and his brethren in the ministry, conveyed by train, with the cars draped in mourning, and with the engine-bell ceaselessly tolling, to the graveyard at Morristown where he had desired his dust might sleep.

## HISTORICAL SOCIETY NEWS

Our Historical Library at Pennington School is a major resource for United Methodism in N.J. Any Church writing a history should consult our holdings. There is a complete set of Conference Minutes from 1837 to date, a complete set of Delaware Conference Minutes on microfilm, M. P. Minutes that go back before 1900 and even earlier on microfilm, and some basic E. U. B. material. Our collection of Methodist *Disciplines* is nearly complete.

Biographies and auto-biographies of a number of N.J. ministers provide important information. We also have some ministers' manuscript Journals including one of the Rev. Richard Swain for 1792. The latest addition to our Library holdings are General Conference *Minutes* of the M.E. Church, 1884-1936 and of the M. P. Church 1916-1936.

Archival material includes records of many closed Churches, some Circuit records plus some of still active churches. There are also records from many Conference Boards and Agencies. We would strongly urge all Conference agencies to search out their non-current records and deposit them in our Archives. We also maintain a file of local church histories and ask each Church to supply us with a copy of any history or records of historic happenings. All of the above is for your research use.

The Conference Resource Center contains films, film strips and slides on many aspects of United Methodism and Church history. Know what is available and use them.

You are invited to become a member of the Society by the payment of annual dues of \$3 per person or \$5 per couple. Dues payment should be sent to the Rev. James Thompson, 20 Union Street, Manahawkin, N. J. 08050.

Inquiries or comments, gifts or books or other material should be addressed to the Society President, Dr. J. Hillman Coffee, 216



Engleside Ave., Beach Haven, N.J. 08008 or to Historian-Archivist, Rev. Robert B. Steelman, 207 Locust Ave., West Long Branch, N.J. 07764. We also have available at \$1 per copy, "Services and Resources for Worship on Historic Occasion," and Guidelines for Local Church Historians and Records and History Committees," both published by the General Commission on Archives and History. We also have for free "Guidelines for Writing a Local Church History." The above material is available from Rev. Steelman.

#### *HISTORICAL SOCIETY OFFICERS*

<i>Chairperson</i>	Dr. J. Hillman Coffee, Sr.
<i>Vice Chairperson</i>	Mrs. Edna Molyneaux
<i>Secretary</i>	Mrs. Doreen Dyer
<i>Financial Secretary</i>	Rev. James E. Thompson
<i>Librarian</i>	Miss Emily M. Johnson
<i>Historian-Archivist</i>	Rev. Robert B. Steelman